

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>WILLIAM A. HIMCHAK, III,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:14-CV-1640</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Chief Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>KATHLEEN KANE, Attorney</b>	:	
<b>General of the Commonwealth of</b>	:	
<b>Pennsylvania, <i>et al.</i>,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 6th day of October, 2014, upon consideration of the third motion (Doc. 16) for reconsideration filed by *pro se* plaintiff William A. Himchak (“Himchak”), wherein Himchak seeks *vacatur* of the court’s orders (Docs. 11, 13, 15) denying his request for injunctive relief and his motions to reconsider those rulings, and further requests recusal and disqualification of the undersigned given these adverse rulings, (Doc. 16 at 6-7), and the court reaffirming that Himchak’s request for injunctive relief is of no merit and that Himchak does not state a valid basis for reconsideration of the court’s initial or subsequent orders, see Max’s Seafood Café v. Quinteros, 176 F.3d 669, 677-78 (3d Cir. 1999); Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985), and the court further finding that Himchak’s allegations of “extreme bias” against the undersigned are conclusory, speculative, and entirely

without merit,<sup>1</sup> it is hereby ORDERED that Himchak's third motion (Doc. 16) for reconsideration and for recusal and disqualification of the undersigned is DENIED.

/S/ Christopher C. Conner  
Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge  
United States District Court  
Middle District of Pennsylvania

---

<sup>1</sup> The substance of Himchak's motion demonstrates his misapprehension of the court's earlier rulings. Himchak repeatedly emphasizes his belief that the claims underlying his civil complaint are meritorious and implies that the court's orders deny him his right to a jury trial. (See Doc. 16 at 4, 6-7 (arguing that the court's "repeated attempts to make my case a paper trial" compel recusal)). The court clarifies for Himchak's benefit that resolution of his motion for injunctive relief is not dispositive to his claims. This matter shall proceed consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of Court.